

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, and 12-14 are pending. Claims 3, 6-8, 10-11, and 15-27 have been canceled. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1, 5-6, 12-15, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Clark (US 6,400,276).

Claims 2-3 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Clark in view of Sorrells (US 6,720,866).

Claims 4, 7-9, and 23-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Clark in view of Paganini (US 4,420,751).

Claims 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Clark in view of Horn (US 5,091,713).

Claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Clark in view of Sorrells and Hoffman (US 5,777,562).

The 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claim 1 now includes additional subject matter from original claims 5 and 12 and the specification. Clark does not teach the recited features, relationships, and steps. Clark does not compare user interface image data, and then (responsive to met differences in the compared image data) compare sensed radiation, and then (responsive to met differences in the compared radiation) determine that the machine has an unauthorized device, and then send user interface image data to enable fraud confirmation. Clark does not anticipate the method of claim 1.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claim 4

Paganini cannot alleviate the admitted deficiencies in Clark. Paganini is directed to sensing the presence of a potential machine user or the departure of a current machine user (e.g., col. 2, lines 27-44). Paganini is not directed to the recited features and relationships involving unauthorized device determination and confirmation. Paganini does not teach or suggest executing a sequence of actions (including comparing sensed radiation) responsive to determining that a person is in proximity to a user interface for an extended time without the person attempting a transaction, and then (responsive to met differences in the compared radiation) determining that the machine has an unauthorized device, and then sending user interface image data to enable fraud confirmation.

The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Nor would it have been obvious to have combined the references in the manner alleged to have produced the recited invention of claim 4.

Claim 9

Paganini cannot alleviate the admitted deficiencies in Clark. The relied upon section (col. 9, lines 62-65) of Paganini is directed to retrieving a single user's receipt back into an ATM. It is unclear how this relied section is material to the recited invention. Paganini does not teach or suggest executing a sequence of actions (including comparing sensed radiation) responsive to determining that a plurality of sequential users did not take their respective receipts, and then (responsive to met differences in the compared radiation) determining that the machine has an unauthorized device, and then sending user interface image data to enable fraud confirmation.

The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Nor would it have been obvious to have combined the references in the manner alleged to have produced the recited invention of claim 9.

The Dependent Claims

Each of the dependent claims depends directly or indirectly from an independent claim. The independent claims have been shown to be allowable. Thus, it is asserted that the dependent claims are allowable on the same basis. Furthermore, each of the dependent claims recites additional specific features and relationships that further patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the applied art.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. The undersigned will be happy to discuss any aspect of the Application at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Locke Reg. No. 31,029
WALKER & JOCKE
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 721-0000